



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/595,660

06/16/2000

Eric Teller

1148/015

2830

23861

7590

09/05/2006

METZ LEWIS, LLC  
11 STANWIX STREET  
18TH FLOOR  
PITTSBURGH, PA 15222

EXAMINER

PASS, NATALIE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3626

DATE MAILED: 09/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/595,660	TELLER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Natalie A. Pass	3626	

**All Participants:**

(1) Natalie A. Pass.

(2) John Monocello (Reg. No. 51022).

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) Joseph Thomas.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 22 August 2006

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
*none*

Claims discussed:  
*none*


Prior art documents discussed:  
*none*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

  
 JOSEPH THOMAS  
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

  
 (Applicant's Representative Signature - if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Discussion revolved around the Appeal Brief submitted 18 May 2006, which is non-compliant because the claimed invention is not mapped to the independent claims separately, and for each dependent claim argued separately, which shall refer to the specification by page and line number and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters, in the Summary of the Claimed Subject Matter section of the Appeal Brief. In addition, The Appeal Brief did not contain a Related Appeals and Interferences Appendix and a clearly designated Evidence Appendix.